

The use of mothers' names in Ptolemaic documents: a case Greek- Egyptian influence?

Mark Depaww

St. Franse University, Department of Sociology
mark_depaww@gmail.com

Abstract

I propose to construct a model of the economic and legal activities of women in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt as represented in Demotic documentary texts. This will involve detailed study of economic and legal documents written in Demotic such as marriage agreements, annuity contracts, wills, documents of divorce, sale, receipt, and renunciation, as well as letters. Many of these documents come from family archives. Most of these will be from published sources. Such a model will be compared with the existing model of women in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt presently based on Greek sources. Greater knowledge of the lives of Egyptian women in these periods can also be used to add to knowledge of women in the Pharaonic period, due to the differing nature and greater quantity of the material surviving from later times.

The periods of Egyptian history under discussion here are Ptolemaic and Roman, i.e. from the conquest of Alexander in 332 BC to the end of the 1st/early 2nd Century AD after which time Demotic ceased to be used for writing official documents. The texts which are the focus of the study are written in Demotic. This form of Egyptian began to be used in the time of Psammetichus I of the 26th Dynasty (ca. 650 BC) and by the end of this Dynasty, Demotic was the chief means of recording business and everyday transactions. In the Ptolemaic period Demotic was also used to write literary texts.¹ Under the Romans,

Demotic ceased to be used for business documents, probably because of government policy, although the production of literary, religious and scientific texts continued.² Thus most of the Demotic texts which will be used in this dissertation date to the Ptolemaic period, especially as these are chiefly of a legal and economic nature

Keywords: *Egypt, history, Romans, Demotic*

After the end of hostilities in October 1939, Germany has made a division of the occupied territories of the Polish state. The northern and eastern regions (including Greater Poland, Silesia, Eastern Pomerania) were incorporated into the Third Reich. From the remaining areas (Little Poland Mazovia, Lublin region) was on 26.10.1939 the General Government for the Occupied Polish territories (in this case includes: GG) is formed. On 07/31/1940 its name was changed to the General Government. This was divided into four districts: Warsaw, Radom, Lublin and Krakow. After the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, the Basic Law has been increased by the fifth district of Galicia. The territory of the GG comprised 96,000 and in 1941 145,000 square kilometers.^{*1}

The General was a structure of an unclear structural-legal position. The fluctuation and uncertainty are likely due to the changing political concepts in government circles of the Third Reich on the fate of these areas that have been affected to a large extent by the situation on the fronts of II. World War. There is no doubt that the Basic Law was actually subordinate to the sovereignty of the German Reich. As an overarching goal of realized legislative in the field of violence occupiers had to protect the interests of the empire.^{*2}

Criminal law should be treated in the field of GG during the II. World War as a term that had a diverse character. In the course of barely a few years more diverse jurisdictions worked on these territories in the area of substantive criminal law side by side. The occupiers chose here for an unusual solution. It was created a two-tier legal system. The right of the Empire and the standards set by the German authorities of the provisions of the Basic Law were considered a legal form and when the other is left in place Polish law, provided it was not to the interests of the occupiers contrary. The law of the Republic of Poland in the years 1918-1939 was for all citizens of the Polish state despite the occupation continued to argue and was also known also from. Polish Underground State acknowledged. Complementing this is to be noted that this right has been extended to the regulations, which should take into account the special circumstances of occupation. It is noteworthy also that these different jurisdictions have often overlapped and sometimes even met

each other. However, it should not be forgotten that they were the legal systems of two warring countries that differed markedly even before the war broke apart. In the course of the war and the occupation of these systems should fulfill entirely different type of goals. Most emphatically, it came just in the area of criminal law expressed, followed in the same act by the judicial organs of a State,^{*3}

Because of Hitler's decree of 12.10.1939 (entered into force on 26.10.) A dualistic legal form in the GG designed. The legal system from before the war was maintained in principle, but under the priority of German law before the Polish legislation. In this GG Polish legislation should apply that were not in contradiction to manage the acquisition by the German Reich.^{*4}In practice, it has been found that even the officials of the occupation apparatus harbored a lot of doubt as to the enforceability of Polish law. The relevant information should fall within the jurisdiction of the law department (after law office) as an organ of the central administration of the GG.^{*5}

The dominant legal system in the GG was the German law. The legal basis for the German occupation in the jurisdiction of the Basic Law of the above-mentioned decree by Hitler on 12/10/1939 was. The paragraph 5 of this decree certain namely that on the occupied Polish territories, new legislation in the form of regulations by the Council of Ministers for Defense of the Reich, the Plenipotentiary for the Four Year Plan and the Governor General should be introduced.^{*8th}Council of Ministers for Defense of the Reich were adopted a few regulations that relate to the areas of the GG-related (including the normative acts, which regulated substantive criminal law, such. As the pass criminal Regulation of 27 May 1942 RGBI I, pp 348- 350). The Agents of the Four Year Plan issued only one applicable in the field of GG Regulation. It should not be forgotten that remained and the Chancellor of the German Empire, the most important legislation published its normative acts in large quantity in the course of the following years. During the occupation, even those normative acts were enacted for GG, those of other central organs of the Third Reich as Interior Minister, Justice Minister, Labor Minister, Finance Minister, Defense Minister General Representative adopted for the administrative affairs of the Empire and General Manager for work. Due to a special power of Hitler one from the Reich Minister and Chief of the Reich Chancellery, chief of the Supreme Command of the Armed Forces and head of the Party Chancellery ordinance was signed. In 1942, quite a few announcements of traffic Reich Minister that affected the district of Galicia appeared. The normative acts adopted by the central organs of the German Reich to the General Government included often a strong determination on the binding force in the field of GG and most often they were published simultaneously in Germany and in the Basic

Law. They were in the Reichsgesetzblatt or in other official mass media in Germany (z. B. in the realm worksheet) and in the Official Gazette for the General Government published (including the normative acts, which regulated substantive criminal law, for. example, the Regulation on the exercise of service penal power in the new territories of 3 January 1943 RGBI I, page 1-2). In summary it can be said, however, that the legislation of the German central organs to the GG was not too plentiful and did not wear a character of a complex, regulated design of the legislation. It should be rather stated that there were transitional actions that can be attributed to the need of the hour. Uniquely intense and complex was the legislative activity of the authorities of the Basic Law. Regulation on the exercise of punitive power service in the new territories of 3 January 1943 RGBI I, pp 1-2). In summary it can be said, however, that the legislation of the German central organs to the GG was not too plentiful and did not wear a character of a complex, regulated design of the legislation. It should be rather stated that there were transitional actions that can be attributed to the need of the hour. Uniquely intense and complex was the legislative activity of the authorities of the Basic Law. Regulation on the exercise of punitive power service in the new territories of 3 January 1943 RGBI I, pp 1-2). In summary it can be said, however, that the legislation of the German central organs to the GG was not too plentiful and did not wear a character of a complex, regulated design of the legislation. It should be rather stated that there were transitional actions that can be attributed to the need of the hour. Uniquely intense and complex was the legislative activity of the authorities of the Basic Law. was controlled design of the legislation. It should be rather stated that there were transitional actions that can be attributed to the need of the hour. Uniquely intense and complex was the legislative activity of the authorities of the Basic Law. was controlled design of the legislation. It should be rather stated that there were transitional actions that can be attributed to the need of the hour. Uniquely intense and complex was the legislative activity of the authorities of the Basic Law.^{*9} The proclamations had a political-propagandistic nature, the decrees related primarily to state system issues the regulations replaced laws and should establish the system of applicable law (the Governor General issued many regulations which included the provisions of substantive criminal law. I analyze it in following in this article). Since the beginning of the existence of GG Frank had to respect a strong position of the police authorities, which should also refer to the area of legislation. The package of legislation from the 10.26.1939, the Regulation of the Governor General found which gave the higher commander of the SS and the police in the GG the right

to issue decrees. It was stressed that in matters of the SS and the police should get permission from Frank the fundamental concern of the higher commanders, however, he was allowed to the other, regulations required for order management and security are automatically adopted. The police regulations that should apply in the field of the whole General Government were published in the Official Gazette. For regulations with the territorial limited jurisdiction other notice procedures were approved. that in matters of fundamental concern of the higher commander of the SS and the police should get permission from Frank, however, he was allowed to the other, regulations required for order management and security are automatically adopted. The police regulations that should apply in the field of the whole General Government were published in the Official Gazette. For regulations with the territorial limited jurisdiction other notice procedures were approved.^{*10}The role of an official medium filled the "Official Gazette of the Governor General of the occupied Polish territories", which was issued in parallel since 10.31.1939 in the Basic Law and in the realm. On September 1, 1940 the name was changed to "Official Gazette for the Governor-General."

Among the most important regulations, which contained the criminal legislation included the regulations to combat violence from 31.10.1939, Regulation on the special courts of 15.10.1939, Regulation on the Polish jurisdiction of 19.02.1940, Regulation on the German jurisdiction from 19/02/1940 .^{*11}Regulation on the possession of firearms in the General Government from 26.11.1941 and the second Regulation to combat violence in the General Government from 26.11.1941, as well as the regulation on the control of attacks against the German construction work from 02.10.1943.^{*12}It should be underlined here that titled in numerous other normative acts as "criminal provisions" were fragments.

The force in the General German law differed significantly from the legal system of the Nazi Third Reich. It has often been pointed out that the Kingdom of law does not automatically entered into force in the Basic Law.^{*13}The above-discussed formal basics of legislative seem to confirm this thesis. yet it should not be forgotten that can be used by the authorities, and above all by the courts as a credible test the effectiveness of a legal system only the analysis of its practical application. In the GG were on one hand the German jurisdiction and besides the recognized

under the law of the II. Republic of Poland Polish or non-German jurisdiction. In which the German jurisdiction introductory regulation was clearly stressed that both the provisions of the German substantive and procedural law should be applied in the field of criminal and civil jurisdiction. After the processing of the files of several dishes I've found*

¹⁴

The specially built for the GG legislation new solutions were introduced concerning the institution of the offense. Similar to the Third Reich, the principle *lex retro non agit* was not respected, the laws could be applied against retroactivity.

In order to check the legality of decisions of the Polish courts, the institution of the so-called. Verification law was introduced. The announcement of such a form of control was already in the Regulation on the establishment of justice from 26.10.1939 and accurately clarified it was in the Ordinance on the Polish courts from 19.02.1940. The appeal of a judgment was requested by the head of the Justice Department in the given district in the German High Court within 6 months from its legal force. As a prerequisite was a violation of the public interest. The German high court could approve the decision or cancel it. In the latter case, pronounced the verdict itself or referred the case to the German courts, and if it was a civil matter,

Characteristic of the criminal situation in the GG was the fact that the review law came into force retroactively. All decisions of the Polish courts, which entered into force after 31 July 1938, could be reviewed. From this for Poland anyway unfavorable principle a broad exception has been made yet. In particularly relevant cases if the decision violated the interests of the German nation, the decision could be reviewed without any consideration of the time that had elapsed since the date of its legal effect. The decision on the review of the decision could be taken by GG in such a situation by the head of the justice department.*¹⁸

A fundamental normative act in the field of substantive criminal law was the regulation on the control of violence from 31.10.1939. At the beginning of the existence of the Basic Law, a catalog was separated from matters that were of interest for the safety of the occupier most essential. Among them were counted:

- acts of violence against the rich and against the German authorities in the GG;
- willful damage done to institutions of the German authorities and their labor organizations or institutions of public utility;
- Call or encouragement to disobey regulations or orders of the German authorities;

- acts of violence against the Germans because they belong to the German nation;
- arson of property of the Germans ".

The responsibility also helped the assistants and instigator. Punishable was the attempt of these actions, the concept of an experiment designed far. "Those who conspired to commit a crime, whoever comes to this, with others to an agreement who is offering the commission of a crime or accepting such an offer." The offense also referred to people who had learned of the commission intent of the criminal offenses and of which the authorities or the person at risk have not been informed.^{* 19}

The regulation on gun ownership from 09/12/1939, so even from before the foundation of the Basic Law should apply to persons with weapons, ammunition, hand grenades, explosives or other war equipment possessed. The provisions of that Regulation have been maintained in the Basic Law also expanded accordingly and "who gets a message about an illegal gun ownership by another person and notifying the authorities can also be subject to a penalty."^{* 20}

During the occupation, the transfer of solutions in the field of substantive criminal law of the Third Reich could have happened to the Basic Law. The easiest way were the regulations of Hitler, which entered into force in both the Empire and in GG (they were also published in the Official Gazette of the Government General).^{* 21} Another type was the law of the Governor General, which took into account the changes in the law in Germany. This refers, for example, to the introduction of III from. Empire known construction "of a habit offender". The "as strict or as much condemned by criminals that they should be regarded as a constant danger to the community", were from the Polish (non-German) jurisdiction "held to ensure" or even condemned by the German special courts to death are, if it was made out of consideration for "the protection of the general public or the need for a just retribution." In the realities of the Basic Law, it meant the chance to break the fundamental principles of legality,^{* 22}

Similar to the German Reich the generalization of criminal responsibility for any violations of the applicable provisions in the Basic Law was introduced towards the end of the war. Punishable under Regulation from 10.02.1943 the violation of laws, regulations, orders and decrees of the authorities was too difficult with the intention of "the German integration in the General Government" or hinder it. This also was true for the trial; responsibility also wore the assistants and instigator.^{* 23}

In the General even a few hundred normative acts were (they made *leges speciales* in relation to the Polish and German criminal code is)

adopted in which the actions of criminal deeds were told that remain under normal circumstances beyond the scope of criminal law. A wide expanded penalization concerned such areas as cultural activities, work and club activity.^{*24}

The definitions of the issues were often controlled according to a constant pattern. A standard formula was worded as follows: "Whoever undertakes to act contrary to its provisions shall be punished".^{*25}

A characteristic feature of substantive criminal law in the Basic Law, the difference that annexed by another of the Third Reich territories, was not only to maintain the privileged status of the Germans, but also the differentiation of the legal status of Poles and Jews. Was expressed it in the already adopted in 1939 normative acts. The rules established for the Jews contained more far-reaching and don'ts and saw significantly tougher sanctions for their injuries. As an example the rules on the introduction of the obligation to work for the Polish population of the GG can serve. For the Jews a special regulation on the introduction of compulsory labor was adopted on the same day that still contained stricter regulations.^{*27} In the legislative way the Jews of personal liberty, property, freedom of choice of employment, the right to education, the freedom of choice of residence, freedom of movement, were robbed in the overseas trip. It has even introduced the ban to leave the residence.^{*28} Since mid-1941, the number of legislative acts adopted exclusively for the Jewish population is drastically reduced. Maybe it is due to the increasing competencies of Himmler in relation to the planned extermination of the Jews.^{*29} pright obtained from the occupiers learned Polish law in terms of the system of no changes in the penal code of 1932 resulting penalties. The occupiers, however, have limited the verdict freedom of Polish judges. There have been limited to date skills of Polish courts because they were considered by the occupation authorities of the GG Justice Department as permissions from the character of the grace of law. The authorities of the justice department have declared that the Polish courts no longer have the right, on the sentencing to probation or parole to recognize because they were to be regarded as acts of grace. The extraordinary mitigation of punishment, however, was treated differently because she was regarded as an institution, which refers on punishment and not to the grace of law. In which in some cases are entitled to the court right to withdraw from the penalty imposed despite the Guilty speaking, the occupiers have the right to decide reserved.^{*30}

The sanctions system

The changes made in the Third Reich within the penal system were naturally respected the judicial system of the Basic Law. In the imported GG criminal provisions of the following catalog of the fines was utilized:

death, severe prison, jail, fine, fine asset seizure (they could be separated or imposed as an additional penalty). The additional penalties following penalties were counted: permanent or temporarily limited prohibition (it concerned the doctors), forced labor in the forest. It also was a chance to condemn the Bußzahlung in favor of the victim.

It should be emphasized that the authorities of the Third Reich had also considered the concept of order are kept on the territory of the Basic Law only with the help of police coercion. For the local population this would have meant the absolute deprivation of any legal system. Primarily for economic reasons, this concept was rejected. The Basic Law should be the object of exploitation by the Government and in connection therewith, relying on police action was recognized as inadmissible because they had made a normal functioning of the economic life impossible.^{*31} Gained the upper hand of the view that the establishment of a dualistic legal system is practical, which should, however, administer justice due to the drastically strict criminal laws. Matters referred to above and in the fundamental regulation to combat violence from 31/10/1939 (§ 1-9) were threatened with mandatory death penalty.^{*32} The scope of a draconian penalization in the GG testifies to the fact that this punishment (mandatory or optional) was provided in nearly 30 published in the Official Gazette of the Government General normative acts. These rules issues were regulated, which were not threatened even in the realm of the highest penalties.^{*33} The most important concern the aforementioned Regulation to combat attacks against the German integration in the General Government from 02.10.1943, was that extended criminal liability for any violations of the applicable provisions in the General Government and threatened with the death penalty was. The most spectacular example concerns the condemnation of the Jews to death if they are not relocated to ghettos or left their limitations. Plus, all death penalty were threatened that gave them refuge, especially when they brought the Jews out of the ghetto borders, they fed or hidden.^{*34}

None of the occupied countries, the Germans have introduced so repressive regulations. The economic interests of the occupier served here as the foundation of penalization any resistance to the entry of agricultural products from the GG authorities (and particularly the sabotage of compulsory agricultural quotas). The threat of the death penalty regulations were in GG triple (1942, 1943, 1944), giving the criminal facts were significantly expanded in relation to the pattern of 1942 in the coming years. the duration of the state of emergency for the entry of agricultural products was also extended. In 1942, this was for the period from 1:08. to 30.11. certainly; for the years 1943 and 1944 however, for those from 15:07 to 20:12.).^{*35} As part of a maximum material

exploitation of the population, the very common threat to be (as in more than 60 normative acts) called with the unlimited fine height and different seizure types (in more than 30 normative acts).^{*36}

It should be noted that Himmler next to the system of criminal law and the judicial system in the Basic Law nor had the direct child concentration and extermination camps available. The deportation to the camps did not belong to the catalog of penalties provided in criminal law, but from the perspective of the prisoners could be regarded as one of the most sensitive sanction

I am aware of two general surveys which attempt to give an impression of women in pharaonic Egypt:

Tyldesley, Joyce. 1995. *Daughters of Isis: Women of Ancient Egypt*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Watterson, Barbara. 1991. *Women in Ancient Egypt*. Stroud: Alan Sutton.

Further issues involving Egyptian women have been studied; topics such as marriage and inheritance, amongst others, have been well explored: law,⁵ marriage and marriage contracts,⁶ economy,⁷ inheritance,⁸ literature,⁹ and religion.¹⁰ The lives of Egyptian women have also received attention in surveys of Late Antiquity: whether in surveys of women in that period or of Late Antique Egypt.¹¹ There are published (family) archives which involve women from the Pharaonic period¹² as well as the Late, Ptolemaic and Roman.¹³

However, rarely are such issues taken beyond the data and studied as aspects of the life of an Egyptian woman or with a view to producing a model for the life of an Egyptian woman: her roles as a member of a household, and her economic and legal activity whether on behalf of her family or in her own right, and how these differed from or were the same as those of an Egyptian man. Integrating these individual aspects would go some way towards providing a comprehensive model which could be compared with that existing for Ptolemaic or Roman period women in Greek texts¹⁴ or women elsewhere in the Near East.¹⁵ Indeed, women's history - whether in terms of representations of women in literature or women as legal and economic entities - has attracted considerable attention in the areas of classical and biblical studies, for example:¹⁶ Jewish women in biblical studies,¹⁷ in the Hellenistic world,¹⁸ and in Egypt.¹⁹

A considerable amount of work has been done on the social history of Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.²⁰ However, almost all of this is based on Greek material studied by Classicists and thus

approached from the viewpoint of the Classical world. As Bowman and Woolf write, "...the Greek papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt have been very well served by Greek papyrologists whilst the far smaller number of Demotists has not been able to do justice to a corpus of demotic papyri which is very much larger than the published sample would suggest."²¹

Comparison between Egypt and other Hellenized areas or elsewhere in the Roman Empire is productive and relevant; Egypt was, after all, a part of the Hellenistic world and the Roman Empire. However, without consideration of traditions and practices of native Egyptians, understanding of the Greek material cannot be complete. The relative inaccessibility of the Demotic material prevents its extensive use by Classicists, and, as Pomeroy writes, "...social historians interested in Ptolemaic Egypt...would welcome more studies of the indigenous women by Demotists."²² Egyptologists themselves have lacked interest in the history of Egypt's later periods, tending to regard it as "degenerate." As Ritner writes: "Note how few Demotists there are in the world, how few contemporary Egyptologists extend their interests past Tutankhamen and the New Kingdom 'flowering.' In the past, Demotists have been considered almost 'suspect' to 'mainstream' Egyptologists.

References:

1. Johnson, 1991b: 1.
2. Lewis, 1993a: 276-277.
3. As described in Pomeroy, 1990. Pomeroy's work is focused on the Ptolemaic period, and the term "Hellenistic" is used by her in reference to persons who operated within a Greek speaking milieu who regarded themselves as Greek (as opposed to Egyptian) and is so used here.
4. Also Bryan, Capel, Johnson, Markoe, and Hershey Roehrig. 1997. *Mistress of the House, Mistress of Heaven; Women in Ancient Egypt*. New York: Hudson Hills Press Incorporated.
5. Meleze-Modrzejewski, 1995; Pestman, 1995: 79-87; Scholl, 1995.
6. Katzoff, 1995; Luddeckens, 1960; Martin, 1995; Pestman, 1961.; Smith, 1995; Thompson, 1934.
7. Manning, 1992; Menu, 1989; Pestman, 1969a & b; Shore, 1968; Thompson, 1934.
8. Clarysse, 1995; Pestman, 1968 and 1969a; Thompson, 1934.
9. Depla, 1994.
10. Naguib, 1992 and 1993; Robins, 1993a.

11. Bagnall, 1995b and 1993a: 92-98, 130-132 and 181-207; Clark, 1993.
12. Goedicke, 1984; James, 1962; Wente, 1967 and 1990.
13. Amir, 1959; Andrews, 1990; Boswinkel and Pestman, 1982; Glanville, 1939; Pestman, 1980, 1981, 1993 and 1994; Shore and Smith, 1959: 52-60. Spiegelberg, 1913; Thompson, 1934.
14. Pomeroy, 1990.
15. See notes 17, 18 and 19. For Persia see, Brosius, 1996 and for Neo-Babylonian material see Roth, 1989a & b and 1993a.
16. The bibliographical information in this paper is in no way intended to be exhaustive.
17. Archer, 1994; Brock, 1994; Meyers, 1989.
18. Archer, 1990; Levine, 1991.
19. Porten, 1968: 234-263.
20. Bagnall, 1985 and 1993a; Bradley, 1980; Lewis, 1983 and 1986; Thompson, 1994 and 1988.
21. Bowman & Woolf, 1994b: 11: the small number of Demotists probably being due to lack of interest in the field of Egyptology itself (see note 23).
22. Pomeroy, 1990: vii.
23. Ritner, 1992: 284f.
24. Lewis, 1983: 18f and 1986: 4.
25. In fact it appears that this may even have been the intention of the rulers: "Through education...and tax-breaks, the new Greek rulers encouraged the adoption of their language within the administration of Egypt" (Thompson, 1994: 77) as part of an overarching policy: "...the Ptolemies used education combined with tax incentives to encourage Hellenisation among the majority population of Egypt" (idem: 82). Thompson thinks it likely that bureaucrats received specialised scribal training due to the varied technical nature of Ptolemaic administrative documents (idem: 77). Lewis writes that Dryton, a Greek cavalry officer living in the largely Egyptian town of Pathyris had his third will witnessed by five men, four of whom "signed in native [i.e. demotic] script because there is not in this area the like number of Greeks" (1986: 99). See also Johnson, 1991a: 125-126.
26. See Wilfong, 1994, for use of Coptic in everyday transactions.
27. Even within the writing of Greek texts in Egypt there is much reason to stress the survival of Egyptian as a spoken language: "... the argument that Greek triumphed because of the greater simplicity of its alphabet implies that those who learnt it were not literate in Egyptian, but ... the rush, the Egyptian writing instrument, used instead of the reed

for writing Greek in bilingual offices suggests rather the employment of scribes literate in both languages I suspect that the Egyptian remained their first spoken language" (Thompson, 1994: 78).

28. As pointed out by Ray (Ray, 1994: 63f) there are levels of literacy, varying with its use: One might term this "functional literacy" e.g. competence limited to writing mummy labels, and inability to write much else, "since this state of semi-literacy was sufficient for the everyday needs of the writer, it may not have been felt as a deficiency." Ray continues: "It is worth recalling the truism that ability to read and ability to write are not the same; certainly they do not correspond exactly in any society. This is especially true of a complex writing system such as demotic. The number who could read demotic, at least for simple economic purposes, is likely to have been considerable, although still far below that which is supposed to apply in the modern West. On the other hand, the number of demotic writers was doubtless far more restricted; this can be deduced, among other reasons, from the competence of the surviving texts...Demotic, like other scripts, was employed in a wide variety of situations, and the need for literacy, as well as the uses to which it was put, would have varied correspondingly widely"(Ray, 1994: 64).

29. Baines and Malek: 73 and 82.

30. It seems that Dryton's wife, Apollonia, was descended from a family of Egyptianized Greeks (Ritner, 1984: 187). However, that Apollonia was descended from Greeks is denied by Bagnall who considers her description of herself as Greek as a social affectation (Bagnall, 1988: 23-24).

31. Lewis, 1986: 88-103 and Pomeroy, 1990: 103-124, especially 118.

32. Pomeroy, 1990: 118-119.

33. Addressed at some length in Goudriaan, 1988 and Bilde et al., 1992.

34. Ritner, 1992: 289 and note 33.

35. Goudriaan, 1988: 116. In other words, people might have referred to themselves as being Greek or Egyptian in a particular document but outside of the document, in the Ptolemaic period at least, there is no evidence that status was linked to the ethnicity implied in such labels (certainly not officially). As discussed below, the same cannot be said of the sophisticated hierarchy of Roman citizenship, based to a largely on ethnicity, which replaced the Ptolemaic situation.

36. As note 33. See also Bowman, 1986: 122-128.

37. Goudriaan, 1988: 117. However, nomenclature seems to "accurately reflect ethnic origin" in the Family Archive from Siut (Johnson, 1991a: 128).

38. Bowman, 1986: 122-128; Lewis, 1983: 18-35; Seidl, 1973: 129-136.

39. Bowman, 1986: 62-63 and Lewis, 1983: 185-195 and 1993a: 279. With Egypt's absorption into the Roman Empire, the volume of documentation (but not religious, literary or scientific texts) in Demotic declined sharply and there is reason to believe that this was the product of Imperial policy. The apparent cessation of the "bipartite judiciary," to which there are no references in any source from the Roman period, reinforces that this was probably intentional of the part of the government (Lewis, 1993a: 276-281). "Egyptians stopped writing their business documents in Demotic because the Roman reorganization of the administration of Egypt denied such documents the recognition, or status, they had previously enjoyed"(idem: 277).

40. Pomeroy, 1990: 119f.; Huzar, 1988: 359-360; and Seidl, 1973: 139, and, despite the *ius (3) liberorum*, according to which a woman could act for herself without a guardian (Pomeroy, 1988: 718 & 721 and Seidl, 1973: 139f.), Seidl notes "doch treten die Frauen in den Papyri der Römerzeit meistens in einem *kyrios* auf" (Seidl, 1973: 140). However, in pointing out how misleading the information documents give can sometimes be, Pestman refers to land owned by one woman, Tatehathyris, who leases it on her own behalf before marriage and does so on at least one more occasion after marriage. Her husband then leases this same land and represents it as belonging to him without mention of his wife (Pestman, 1990: 52). However, here it is a question of the land being a family asset, and thus the man is acting on behalf of his family as the land is a family asset. Pestman also notes numerous occasions when women acted in Greek law without a guardian but notes that "no scholar has been able to determine whether the use of the *kyrios* changed over time, or whether such assistance was required only in certain kinds of cases" (Pomeroy, 1990: 200 note 84 and Pestman, 1969b: 17-19). See also Pestman, 1995.

41. As suggested in Pomeroy, 1990: 120.

42. Pomeroy, 1990: 120f.

43. Further questions arise from this point: - Why would a Greek husband allow his Egyptian wife to do this? Why does he not make her act through a guardian?

44. The giving of movables or immovables as dowry may have had a range of sociological implications, see Pomeroy, 1988: 714-715.

45. Pomeroy, 1988: 711. This statement also serves to illustrate a lack of understanding of Pharaonic Egyptian traditions and their significance to Hellenistic Egyptian society, as "from an Egyptian point of view things may not have changed as much in Ptolemaic Egypt as a

study of only the Greek records would suggest...the Ptolemies brought with them no fundamental changes in the structure of Egyptian society, including bureaucracy." (Johnson, 1991a: 131). In Egypt, if one is to look at Egyptian society as a whole, and not only that operating in the Greek speaking milieu, there could not be a question of "release of land to ownership by women" because women had always been able to own land. Such misunderstanding is apparent elsewhere in Pomeroy's work: "The principal reason for the high status of women in Ptolemaic Egypt is the reduction in the polarity between the sexes. This new balance is apparent in both literature and life," (Pomeroy, 1990: xvii.). Again, as far as the Egyptian sources are concerned it would appear that if women had a "high status" in Ptolemaic times, this would merely be a continuation of the equality with men they had previously enjoyed in Pharaonic times (at least in terms of their legal position, and as expressed in the surveys referred to above).

46. Pestman, 1969a.
47. See note 46.
48. See note 61.
49. Tyldesley, 1995: 37.
50. "A great number of mainly hieratic and demotic legal papyri demonstrate that Egyptian women had equal rights to men. Unlike Greek women they could, according to Egyptian law, freely enter into agreements and no guardian (kyrios) was required to assist them" (Pestman, 1990: 52) also cf. Pestman, 1961: 182-184.
51. Allam, 1981, 1985, 1987, 1989, 1990a & b, 1991 and 1996; Fischer, 1989a, 1989b; Luddeckens, 1960; Bierbrier, 1982; Cerny, J. 1945; McDowell, 1990; Menu, 1989; Millard, 1976; Pestman, 1961, 1968, 1969a & b and 1994 (this last, the Persian period archive of Tsenhor, serves as a pre-Ptolemaic control against which to compare the material from the Greek influenced Ptolemaic period); Robins, 1993b; Ward, 1989 and Watterson, 1991.
52. Wilfong, 1994 and Clark, 1993.
53. Lewis, 1989.
54. Cowley, 1923; Kraeling, 1953; Muffs, 1973; Porten, 1968 and Yaron, 1957a, b & c, 1958a, b & c, 1959, 1960a & b, and 1961a & b.
55. Beaulieu, 1993; Harris, 1989; Roth, 1987, 1989a & b, and 1993a.
56. McEwan, 1995; Oelsner, 1986 and 1995; Van der Spek, 1995.
57. Such as that provided in Pomeroy, 1990.
58. This is an "on-line" searchable database at:
59. <http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/test/beinlich.html>
- a. and the "Manuel de Codage" transliteration system is explained at:

60. <http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/test/beinlich.html#manuel>
61. See note 61.
62. There are, however, occurrences of women acting without guardians in Greek documents (see note 40 above).
63. Robins, 1993b: 137 "while some female witnesses are known, the majority were men." Nebnefer's adoption of his wife involved female witnesses (Watterson, 1991: 32). For the "Adoption Papyrus" see Gardiner, 1941: 23-29, Cruz-Urbe, 1988b: 220-223.
64. That there was some discontinuity between Ptolemaic and Roman periods is important to bear in mind, hence the use of "Ptolemaic and Roman Periods" here instead of "Hellenistic" or "Graeco-Roman," cf. Lewis, 1970a.
65. Pestman refers to the example of one archive regarding the property of one Tatehathyrus "Anyone wishing to understand the situation with regard to Tatehathyrus and her plot of land, has therefore to consider the five land leases as a group and within the context of the family archive, because the individual documents are downright misleading: the three leases made by the husband about "his" land invalidate statistics about the extent of women's ownership of land just as the two land leases made by Tatehathyrus herself give the wrong impression of the use actually made by Egyptian women of their legal rights" (Pestman, 1990: 52).
66. Bakhias: Pernigotti and Capasso, 1994.
67. Dakhleh: Hope, 1985; Hope, Kaper, Bowen, and Patten. 1989; Mills, 1990a, b and c.
68. Karanis: Husselman, 1979.
69. Karnak: Redford, Orel, Redford and Schubert, 1991.
70. Medinet Habu: Holscher, 1932, 1933, 1934 and 1954; Kaplony-Heckel, 1992a; Lichtheim, 1957. Medinet Madi: Bresciani, 1968.
71. Saqqara: Jeffreys and Smith, 1988 and Smith, 1974 (as well as the numerous other preliminary reports on the EES excavations at Saqqara).
72. Angerman, 1989; Offen, Roach Pierson and Rendall, 1991; Rabinowitz and Richlin, 1993.